



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	I	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/660,256		09/11/2003	Arthur Ramazanov	4287/1M315US1	5361	
7278	7590	11/17/2005		EXAMINER		
DARBY &		P.C.	SPIVACK, PHYLLIS G			
P. O. BOX 5 NEW YORK		0150-5257		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,			1614		

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application	Application No.		Applicant(s)				
		10/660,25	56	RAMAZANOV ET AL.					
	Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit					
		Phyllis G.		1614					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commur or Reply	nication appears on the	cover sheet wit	h the correspondence a	ddress				
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE NOTES IN 1997. THE NOTES IN 1997 IN 19	MAILING DATE OF THE S of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no even munication. It tatutory period will apply and way will, by statute, cause the app	HIS COMMUNIC ent, however, may a re Il expire SIX (6) MONT lication to become ABA	ATION. ply be timely filed  THS from the mailing date of this and the mailing date of the	٠.				
Status									
1)	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on							
	•	2b)⊠ This action is n	on-final.						
3)	Since this application is in condition	for allowance except	for formal matte	ers, prosecution as to th	e merits is				
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Dispositi	on of Claims								
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the	application.							
·	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>10 and 11</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
5)□	Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
6)⊠	Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.								
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.								
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restrict	ction and/or election r	equirement.		-				
Applicati	on Papers								
9)[	The specification is objected to by th	ne Examiner.							
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are	: a) accepted or b)	objected to b	y the Examiner.					
	Applicant may not request that any obje	ection to the drawing(s) t	e held in abeyand	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.									
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119								
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:									
۵,۱	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.								
	Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No								
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage								
	application from the Internation	onal Bureau (PCT Rul	e 17.2(a)).		_				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.									
Attachmen			_						
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	OTO 048)		ummary (PTO-413) )/Mail Date					
3) 🔯 Infor	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (I nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or r No(s)/Mail Date <u>7-7-04; 12-2-03</u> .			formal Patent Application (PT	TO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/660,256

Art Unit: 1614

Applicants' Response filed September 8, 2005 to the Restriction Requirement is acknowledged. Applicants have elected Group I, claims 1–9, drawn to methods for treating obesity, for reducing total body weight and for reducing body fat mass, and pharmaceutical compositions thereto.

Accordingly, claims 10 and 11, drawn to non-elected inventions, are withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b). Claims 1-9 are presently under consideration.

Information Disclosure Statements filed December 2, 2003 and July 7, 2004 are further acknowledged and have been reviewed.

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the present Abstract encompasses subject matter that is not presently under consideration. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over both lgarashi et al., <u>Biosci.</u>, <u>Biotech.</u>, <u>Biochem.</u>, and Yamahara, J., JP2002187845 (abstract).

lgarashi teaches the administration of taxifolin, the compound depicted at the bottom of page 513, where R = H, which is dihydroquercetin, to reduce total body weight and fat mass. See Table I on page 514. In particular, total liver cholesterol decreased significantly. Yamahara teaches the use of saccharides from the buds of the

Art Unit: 1614

Aralia elata plant as an antiobesity drug. Therefore, in view of the combined teachings of Igarashi and Yamahara, one skilled in the art would have been motivated to combine dihydroquercetin, which is also known as taxifolin, with an araloside to treat obesity. Such would have been obvious in the absence of evidence to the contrary because it is generally prima facie obvious to use in combination two or more ingredients that have previously used separately for the same purpose. In re Kerkhoven, 205 USPQ 1069. Obviousness does not require absolute predictability but only the reasonable expectation of success. In re O'Farrell, 7 USPQ 1673.

Specific statements in the references that would spell out the claimed invention are not necessary to show obviousness since questions of obviousness involve not only what references expressly teach, but also what they would collectively suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art. In re Burckel, 201 USPQ 67. Individual references themselves are not required to make a suggestion for the combination to be obvious. For the purposes of combining references, those references need not explicitly suggest combining teachings much less specific references. In re Nilssen, 851 F.2d 1401, 7 USPQ 2d 1500.

The selections of optimal concentrations or ratios of dihydroquercetins and aralosides are parameters well within the purview of the skilled artisan through no more than routine experimentation.

No claim is allowed.

Application/Control Number: 10/660,256

Art Unit: 1614

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Phyllis G. Spivack whose telephone number is 571-272-

0585. The examiner can normally be reached on 10:30 AM-7 PM.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Christopher Low can be reached on 591-272-0951. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

November 11, 2005

Phyllia G. Spivack

PHYLLIS SPIVACK PRIMARY EXAMINER Page 4